

# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/768,546	01/30/2004	Cathy Johnson	551001-1010	6598
24108 75	90 06/09/2005		EXAMINER	
CARLTON FIELDS, PA P.O. BOX 3239			SOTELO, JESUS D	
TAMPA, FL 33601-3239			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3617	
		DATE MAILED: 06/09/2005		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Commence	10/768,546	JOHNSON ET AL.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jesús D. Sotelo	3617				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timed within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) day will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 M	ay 2005.					
	action is non-final.					
Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray 5) ☐ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are allowed. 6) ☐ Claim(s) 11-23 is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8) ☐ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
	10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• ,	` '				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex		,				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents 2. Certified copies of the priority documents 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori	s have been received. s have been received in Applicati ity documents have been receive ı (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)	_					
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5)  Notice of Informal P 6)  Other:					

Application/Control Number: 10/768,546 Page 2

Art Unit: 3617

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1-23 are in the application.

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 11- are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Barrett in view of Young and Carter.

Barrett discloses a storage device for removably attaching to structures on a boat and for storing items; the storage device includes a support member comprising a marine fabric; at least one pocket member 228a for receiving an item to be stored on the boat; and grommets 269, 271 for removably attaching the storage device to a structure on the boat. The support member and the pockets are made from a vinyl, canvas, nylon, or co-polymer or polymeric material; the pockets are formed from an acrylic material. The support member includes a plurality of pockets. Young discloses a storage, similar in function to that of Barrett. Young teaches making the outer edges of the support member reinforced with a binding material. Young also teaches the use of a strap in combination with D-rings for securing the same. Carter discloses a storage device similar to that of Barrett. Carter teaches the use straps for securing a storage bag to a structure.

Barrett does not teach the folding of the support member for creating the pockets. This, however, is a method of construction which does not carry patentable weight in this claim.

Art Unit: 3617

The material used by Barrett is similar to the material used to make the support member in the claims. Variations in the type of material used is deemed to have been an obvious matter of design choice with the skill of one having ordinary skill in the art.

Barrett teaches the use of grommets and S-hooks to connect the support member to a structure on a boat. Carter teaches the use of straps in combination with buckles and hooks for the same purpose. Young teaches the use of a strap in combination with D-rings for securing a storage device. In view of these disclosures, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to substitute for the grommets and hooks used by Barrett to secure the storage device on a boat with straps and securing means generally as taught by Carter. The use of D-rings in combination with straps for securing things is well known in the art as taught by Young. To use D-rings in lieu of buckles in the arrangement above would have been an obvious matter of design choice to one skilled in the art.

4. Claims 19-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biemiller. Biemiller discloses a storage device for removably attaching to a T-top on a boat for storing items comprising a frame 10 comprising a marine fabric having an opening to a storage area defined by the frame for receiving an item; an access flap 40; the access flap being secured to the storage area. The storage device includes a plurality of straps secured to the frame for securing the frame to a T-top on a boat; each of the straps including a first end for attaching to a first structure of the T-top and a second end for attaching to a second structure of the T-top. Biemiller teaches that his storage device can be made from varied materials including plastics. Although the straps in the disclosure of Biemiller are shown as being secured, in use, on the top of the storage device, the device could obviously be used in a reversed condition wherein the

Art Unit: 3617

straps would be located on the bottom of the storage device. The difference would be a mere method of use without any need to modify the structure of the storage device. It is deemed that it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to use the storage device of Biemiller with the straps on the bottom. Such an arrangement would have bee desirable as it would provide additional support to the storage structure.

5. Claim 23 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Biemiller in view of Young.

Young discloses a storage device and teaches the use of a strap and D-rings for securing the strap to a storage device. In view of this disclosures, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to substitute for the buckles of Biemiller with D-rings, generally as taught by Young.

Although the D-rings are not as secure as the buckles disclosed by Biemiller, the use of D-rings would have been a desirable choice to one having ordinary skill in the art as they would be easier and more economical to replace.

## Allowable Subject Matter

6. Claims 1-10 are allowed.

## Response to Arguments

- 7. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 11-23 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
- 8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jesús D. Sotelo whose telephone number is 571-272-6686. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon. Fri. 5:30 AM 2:00 PM.

Art Unit: 3617

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Samuel J. Morano can be reached on 571-272-6684. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Jesús D. Sotelo

Primary Examiner Art unit 3617 KNX 03D69 ©

Jds/sotelo